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Reviewer’s report:

This is a lot of work which gives a good overview of some of the contextual factors which can influence implementation of innovations within pharmacy practice. However, by it's very nature the richness of the individuals studies is missing and this is also not a full typology of all the contextual factors which can influence implementation and their interdependent relationship. I feel the authors could make more of why this paper is important and what it can contribute to the community pharmacy literature.

I have some more specific points:

First sentence is poor and needs re-written.

There could be more in the introduction about why this review was needed, what they data can be used for.

Line 72 spelling mistake

Exclusion criteria line 99 - not clear to me why they excluded studies about adoption. I think adoption can be argued to be the first stage of implementation. In the conclusion one of the key findings is about adoption "pharmacy staff engagement, including the perceptions of pharmacy staff and their belief that the innovation was beneficial." I think the authors need to make their definition of implementation and make their rationale for not including adoption clear.

I'm not clear what type of studies are included? Are these interventions which have been successfully evaluated in a trial and then this includes studies of their implementation into practice. My assumption is that they are not previously developed or evaluated interventions.

Line 163 where or to what literature the CFIR is commonly applied would be useful.

Line 311 spelling mistake

In the discussion I would like to see more about how these findings can be used to inform more research. I think these findings would be useful to inform intervention development as there are calls for implementation into practice to be considered at a much earlier stage.
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